

Juanita R. Brooks (CA SBN 75934) / brooks@fr.com  
Roger A. Denning (CA SBN 228998) / denning@fr.com  
Frank J. Albert (CA SBN 247741) / albert@fr.com  
K. Nicole Williams (CA SBN 291900) / nwilliams@fr.com  
Jared A. Smith (CA SBN 306576) / jasmith@fr.com  
Tucker N. Terhufen (CA SBN 311038) / terhufen@fr.com  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
12860 El Camino Real, Ste. 400  
San Diego, CA 92130  
Telephone: (858) 678-5070 / Fax: (858) 678-5099

Attorneys for Plaintiff,  
FINJAN LLC

Michael A. Jacobs (CA SBN 111664)  
MJacobs@mofo.com  
Matthew A. Chivvis (CA SBN 251325)  
MChivvis@mofo.com  
Diek O. Van Nort (CA SBN 273823)  
DVanNort@mofo.com  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
425 Market Street  
San Francisco, California 94105-2482  
Telephone: (415) 268-7000/Fax: (415) 268-7522

Attorneys for Defendant,  
PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.

*Additional counsel on signature page*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
(SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION)

FINJAN LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 4:14-cv-04908-JD

**FINAL AMENDED JOINT CLAIM  
CONSTRUCTION AND PRE-HEARING  
STATEMENT**

Hon. James Donato  
Ctmm: 11, 19th Floor

**PRE-HEARING STATEMENT**

Pursuant to Your Honor’s Standing Order for Claim Construction in Patent Cases, Joint Case Management Statement and Proposed Order (Dkt. 104) and Patent L.R. 4-3, Plaintiff Finjan LLC (“Finjan”) and Defendant Palo Alto Networks, Inc. (“PAN”) hereby submit this Joint Claim Construction and Pre-Hearing Statement.

**I. PATENT L.R. 4-3(A): PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF EACH AGREED TERM**

The parties’ agreed constructions are provided below.

Patent	Term	Agreed Construction
7,418,731	“scanner”	“software, hardware, or a combination of both for scanning”
8,225,408	“scanner”	“software, hardware, or a combination of both for scanning”
8,225,408	“parser rules”	“patterns of tokens that form syntactical constructs of program code”
8,225,408	“parse tree”	“a hierarchical structure of interconnected nodes built from scanned content”
8,141,154	“transmitter”	“software, hardware, or a combination of both for transmitting”
8,141,154	“receiver”	“software, hardware, or a combination of both for receiving”
8,141,154	“invoking a function”/ “invoke”	“initiating a call to a function, regardless of whether the function is executed/“invoke” does not require execution of a function”

**II. PATENT L.R. 4-3(B): PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF EACH DISPUTED TERM**

The parties’ proposed claim constructions are provided below for disputed terms.<sup>1</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> PAN notes that in addition to the disputed terms that are identified herein, the parties presently dispute the meaning of at least 10 other terms that may require resolution by the Court. *O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.*, 521 F.3d 1351, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2008). Pursuant to the

parties' proposed constructions and supporting evidence is provided in a side-by-side format as required by the Court's Standing Order for Patent Cases in Exhibit A. For simplicity, the supporting evidence is not repeated here. The parties reserve their rights to cite additional supporting evidence based on arguments raised during claim construction briefing.

U.S. Patent No. 7,418,731		
Claim Term	Finjan's Proposed Construction	PAN's Proposed Construction
"file cache"  (claims 1, 3, 14, 17)	"a memory for holding a file, at least temporarily"	"data structure to temporarily store files" <sup>2</sup>  PAN alternatively proposes the following compromise construction:  "software or hardware to temporarily store files for faster retrieval later"
"incoming files from the internet"  (claims 1-3)	No construction necessary; plain and ordinary meaning	"files requested by an intranet computer from the Internet"

U.S. Patent No. 7,647,633		
Claim Term	Finjan's Proposed Construction	PAN's Proposed Construction
"mobile protection code" (claim 14)	"code that, at runtime, monitors or intercepts actually or potentially malicious code operations without modifying the executable code"	"code that, at runtime, monitors or intercepts actually or potentially malicious code operations without modifying the executable code, where the mobile protection code itself must be executable"

Court's Order (Dkt. 141), the parties are identifying only "ten claim terms in the joint claim construction statement" (Dkt. 141 at 2).

<sup>2</sup> The terms "security profile cache" and "security policy cache" are also disputed. PAN believes that these terms should be construed with "file cache" as a single term, which is the reason PAN's original construction included "security profiles" and "security policies." In the original JCCS, Finjan proposed the same definition of "cache" yet argues that the terms should be addressed separately.

U.S. Patent No. 7,647,633		
Claim Term	Finjan's Proposed Construction	PAN's Proposed Construction
"downloadable-information destination" (claim 14)	"a device or process that is capable of receiving and initiating or otherwise hosting a mobile code execution"	"user device that includes one or more devices or processes that are capable of receiving and initiating or otherwise hosting a mobile code execution"
"A computer program product, comprising a computer usable medium having a computer readable program code therein, the computer readable program code adapted to be executed for computer security, the method comprising" (claim 14)	The typographical error in the preamble is corrected to read: "A computer program product, comprising a computer usable medium having a computer readable program code therein, the computer readable program code adapted to be executed for computer security, comprising:"	Indefinite for claiming mixed statutory classes and/or a lack of antecedent basis

U.S. Patent No. 8,225,408		
Claim Term	Finjan's Proposed Construction	PAN's Proposed Construction
"programming language" (claims 1, 3-8, 22)	No construction necessary; plain and ordinary meaning	Indefinite
"lexical constructs for the specific programming language" (claims 1, 3-8, 22)	No construction necessary; plain and ordinary meaning	"elements forming the specific programming language's syntax and defining the operation of the program code"

U.S. Patent No. 8,141,154		
Claim Term	Finjan's Proposed Construction	PAN's Proposed Construction
"content processor"  (claims 1, 2, 6, 7)	No construction necessary; plain and ordinary meaning  To the extent the Court construes this term, Finjan proposes: "a processor that processes content"	"a processor on the protected client/user computer that processes modified content"
"content"  (claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10)	No construction necessary; plain and ordinary meaning.	"data or information, which has been modified and is received over a network"

**III. PATENT L.R. 4-3(C): IDENTIFICATION OF TEN TERMS, THE CONSTRUCTION OF WHICH WILL BE MOST SIGNIFICANT TO RESOLUTION OF THE CASE**

**Finjan's Statement:**

The parties each identified their top five most significant terms to be construed. As part of that process, the parties agreed on one term:

U.S. Patent No. 7,647,633		
Claim Term	Finjan's Proposed Construction	PAN's Proposed Construction
"A computer program product, comprising a computer usable medium having a computer readable program code therein, the computer readable program code adapted to be executed for computer security, the method comprising"  (claim 14)	The typographical error in the preamble is corrected to read:  "A computer program product, comprising a computer usable medium having a computer readable program code therein, the computer readable program code adapted to be executed for computer security, comprising:"	Indefinite for claiming mixed statutory classes and/or lack of antecedent basis

In addition, Finjan identified four additional terms and PAN identified five additional terms, bringing the total disputed terms to be construed to ten, which are included in the table above in

1 Section II.

2 Finjan does not believe that construction of any of the disputed terms will be case or claim  
3 dispositive.

4 **PAN's Statement:**

5 PAN believes that the following terms are dispositive for non-infringement for their  
6 respective patents if PAN's proposed constructions are adopted:

- 7
- 8 • "content"
  - 9 • "content processor"
  - 10 • "parse tree"
  - 11 • "lexical constructs for the specific programming language"
  - 12 • "downloadable-information destination"
  - 13 • "file cache"
  - 14 • "mobile protection code"

15 If PAN's position regarding indefiniteness is adopted for the following terms, these terms  
16 are dispositive of invalidity for their respective patents:

- 17
- 18 • "programming language"
  - 19 • "A computer program product, comprising a computer usable medium having a  
20 computer readable program code therein, the computer readable program code  
adapted to be executed for computer security, the method comprising"

21 **IV. PATENT L.R. 4-3(d): TIME FOR CLAIM CONSTRUCTION HEARING**

22 The parties anticipate that they will not require more than (3) hours for the entire claim  
23 construction hearing.

24 **V. PATENT L.R. 4-3(e): WITNESSES AT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION HEARING**

25 The parties do not believe that live expert testimony is required at the *Markman* hearing.  
26 However, the parties each expect to offer expert declarations in support of their proposed claim  
27 construction positions.

**VI. PATENT L.R. 4-3(f): REQUESTED FACTUAL FINDINGS**

No party requests any factual findings from the Court related to claim construction other than those submitted with any expert declaration that may be served by the parties in accordance with Pat. L.R. 4-3.

Dated: September 20, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Phillip W. Goter

Juanita R. Brooks (CA SBN 75934)

brooks@fr.com

Roger A. Denning (CA SBN 228998)

denning@fr.com

Frank J. Albert (CA SBN 247741)

albert@fr.com

K. Nicole Williams (CA SBN 291900)

nwilliams@fr.com

Jared A. Smith (CA SBN 306576)

jasmith@fr.com

Tucker N. Terhufen (CA SBN 311038)

terhufen@fr.com

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

12860 El Camino Real, Ste. 400

San Diego, CA 92130

Telephone: (858) 678-5070 / Fax: (858) 678-5099

Aamir Kazi (*Pro Hac Vice*)

kazi@fr.com

Lawrence Jarvis (*Pro Hac Vice*)

jarvis@fr.com

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

1180 Peachtree St. NE, 21st floor

Atlanta, GA 30309

Telephone: (404) 892-5005 / Fax: (404) 892-5002

Phillip W. Goter (*Pro Hac Vice*)

goter@fr.com

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

3200 RBC Plaza, 60 South Sixth Street

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 335-5070 / Fax: (612) 288-9696

Susan E. Morrison (*Pro Hac Vice*)

morrison@fr.com

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

222 Delaware Ave., 17th Floor

1 P.O. Box 1114  
2 Wilmington, DE 19801  
3 Telephone: (302) 652-5070 / Fax: (302) 652-0607

4 Tracea Rice (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
5 trice@fr.com  
6 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
7 1000 Maine Ave. Ste. 1000  
8 Washington, DC 20024  
9 Telephone: (202) 783-5070 / Fax: (202) 783-2331

10  
11 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
12 FINJAN LLC  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Diek O. Van Nort

Michael A. Jacobs (CA SBN 111664)  
MJacobs@mofo.com  
Matthew A. Chivvis (CA SBN 251325)  
MChivvis@mofo.com  
Diek O. Van Nort (CA SBN 273823)  
DVanNort@mofo.com  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
425 Market Street  
San Francisco, California 94105-2482  
Telephone: (415) 268-7000/Fax: (415) 268-7522

Rudy Y. Kim (CA SBN 99426)  
RudyKim@mofo.com  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
755 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, California 94304-1018  
Telephone: (650) 813-5600/Fax: (650) 494-0792  
Kyle W.K. Mooney (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Kmooney@mofo.com  
Eric W. Lin (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Elin@mofo.com  
Michael J. DeStefano (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Mdestefano@mofo.com  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
250 West 55th Street  
New York, New York 10019-9601  
Telephone: (212) 468-8000/Fax: (212) 468-7900

Attorneys for Defendant  
PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.

**ATTESTATION PURSUANT TO CIVIL L.R. 5-1(i)**

In accordance with Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from any other signatory to this document.

/s/ Phillip W. Goter

Phillip W. Goter